

Todd M. Schneider (SBN 158253)  
tschneider@schneiderwallace.com  
Guy B. Wallace (SBN 176151)  
gwallace@schneiderwallace.com  
Andrew P. Lee (SBN 245903)  
alee@schneiderwallace.com  
SCHNEIDER WALLACE  
COTTRELL BRAYTON KONECKY LLP  
180 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 421-7100  
Facsimile: (415) 421-7105

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Class  
[Additional counsel appear on next page]

Catherine A. Conway (SBN 98366)  
Gregory W. Knopp (SBN 237615)  
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER &  
FELD LLP  
2029 Century Park East, Suite 2400  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Telephone: (310) 229-1000  
Facsimile: (310) 229-1001  
cconway@akingump.com  
gknopp@akingump.com

Joel M. Cohn (pro hac vice)  
Michael S. McIntosh (pro hac vice)  
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER &  
FELD LLP  
1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: (202) 887-4000  
Facsimile: (202) 887-4288  
jcohn@akingump.com  
mmcintosh@akingump.com

Attorneys for RGIS, LLC (erroneously  
sued as RGIS Inventory Specialists, Inc.)

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

TRISHA WREN and CYNTHIA PIPER, et al.,  
individually and behalf of others similarly  
situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RGIS Inventory Specialists, LLC, RGIS, LLC,  
Does 1-25 Inclusive,

Defendants.

Case Nos.: 3:06-cv-05778 JCS  
3:07-cv-00032 JCS

CLASS AND COLLECTIVE ACTION

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~  
ORDER REGARDING FURTHER  
MAILING OF NOTICE OF PROPOSED  
CLASS SETTLEMENT**

Honorable Joseph C. Spero

1 Additional counsel:

2 David Borgen (SBN 099354)  
dborgen@gdblegal.com

3 James Kan (SBN 240749)  
jkan@gdblegal.com

4 GOLDSTEIN, DEMCHAK, BALLER,  
BORGEN & DARDARIAN  
5 300 Lakeside Drive, Suite 1000  
Oakland, CA 94612  
6 Telephone: (510) 763-9800  
Facsimile: (510) 835-1417

7  
8 Peter Schneider, *pro hac vice*  
pschneider@gsnlaw.com

9 Keith Grady, *pro hac vice*  
kgrady@gsnlaw.com

10 GRADY SCHNEIDER, LLP  
801 Congress, Suite 400  
Houston, TX 77002  
11 Telephone: (713) 228-2200  
Facsimile: (713) 228-2210

12  
13 Jose R. Mata (SBN 83724)  
jmata@wagelawyer.com  
BAILEY PINNEY PC  
14 1498 SE Mill Plain Blvd, Suite 100  
Vancouver, WA 98683  
15 Telephone: (360) 567-2551  
Facsimile: (360) 567-3331  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

STIPULATION

WHEREAS the parties have submitted a proposed class settlement in the above-captioned matter;

WHEREAS the Court granted preliminary approval of the proposed class settlement on September 16, 2010;

WHEREAS Rust Consulting, Inc., the claims administrator herein, mailed notice to 62,594 potential settlement class members on October 15, 2010 based on a mailing list containing the class members' names, last known addresses, and Social Security numbers which were provided to Rust Consulting by defendant;

WHEREAS defendant subsequently discovered that the class list was incomplete, and that there are approximately 2,500 additional class members who should have received notice of the proposed class settlement;

WHEREAS plaintiffs' experts Dr. Drogin and Dr. Kakigi have been able to calculate estimated awards for 737 of these potential settlement class members and have identified over 250 potential settlement class members who are not eligible to receive an award under the settlement, but have been unable to perform an individualized estimate of the awards of the remaining potential class members given the available data and the time constraints of the final approval schedule herein;

WHEREAS even if there were sufficient data and time available to provide further calculations of estimated individual awards, plaintiffs' experts would be required to re-calculate awards for the entire class of over 62,000 persons, and the cost of "running the model" on each occasion exceeds \$20,000;

WHEREAS Dr. Drogin and Dr. Kakigi have calculated an estimated average award (i.e., \$205) that participating settlement class members will receive so as to provide the additional class members referenced above with a reasonable estimate of their potential recovery under the proposed class settlement;

WHEREAS the parties have agreed to provide notice of the settlement of class action in a form that is identical to the notice previously approved by the Court, except that said notice provides an

1 estimated average award in lieu of individualized estimates to the potential settlement class  
 2 members for whom the calculation of individualized estimates is not feasible at this time;

3 WHEREAS the proposed revised notice is attached hereto as Exhibit A;

4 WHEREAS notice of class action settlement providing potential settlement class members  
 5 an average settlement award in lieu of an individualized estimate has been deemed to be legally  
 6 sufficient under applicable precedents. *See, e.g., Marshall v. Holiday Magic, Inc.*, 550 F.2d 1173,  
 7 1177-78 (9th Cir. 1977), *abrogated on other grounds by, Epstein v. MCA, Inc.*, 126 F.3d 1235 (9th  
 8 Cir. 1997) (notice need not “specify [class members’] potential recovery” since it is “a matter of  
 9 conjecture ... how many class members would opt out or submit claims. *The aggregate amount*  
 10 *available to all claimants was specified and the formula for determining one’s recovery was given.*  
 11 *Nothing more specific is needed.*”) (emphasis added); *Grunin v. Int’l House of Pancakes*, 513 F.2d  
 12 114, 122 (8th Cir. 1975) (“the notice may consist of a very general description of the proposed  
 13 settlement, including a summary of the monetary or other benefits that the class would receive and  
 14 an estimation of attorneys’ fees and other expenses.”); Alba Conte & Herbert B. Newberg,  
 15 Newberg on Class Actions § 8:32, at 265 (4th ed. 2002) (“[i]t is unnecessary for the settlement  
 16 distribution formula to specify precisely the amount that each individual class member may expect  
 17 to recover.”);

18 WHEREAS the proposed alternative notice attached as Exhibit A describes the formula that  
 19 will be used to calculate individual awards in section 8 of the notice (“What can I get from the  
 20 settlement?”);

21 WHEREAS the proposed alternative notice attached as Exhibit A provides the aggregate  
 22 amount available to the claimants in the proposed settlement;

23 WHEREAS the precise settlement amount that potential settlement class members can  
 24 expect to receive on an individual basis will be determined if the settlement agreement is approved;

25 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between the parties through their counsel of record  
 26 that the “Official Court Notice of Settlement of Class Action” attached hereto as Exhibit A will be  
 27 sent to potential settlement class members for whom individualized estimates of recovery cannot  
 28 be determined at this time as soon as possible following the above-entitled Court’s approval of this

1 “Stipulation and Proposed Order Re Further Mailing of Notice of Proposed Class Settlement”:

2 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

3  
4 Dated: January 13, 2011

SCHNEIDER WALLACE  
COTTRELL BRAYTON KONECKY LLP

5  
6 By:       /s/        
GUY B. WALLACE  
7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

8 Dated: January 13, 2011

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD, LLP

9  
10 By:       /s/        
JOEL M. COHN  
11 Attorneys for Defendants

12 I, Guy B. Wallace, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file this  
13 Stipulation and [proposed] Order Regarding Further Mailing of Notice of Proposed Class  
14 Settlement by Parties and Counsel. In compliance with General Order 45, X.B., I attest that Joel  
15 M. Cohn has concurred in this filing.

16  
17 **ORDER**

18 The Court, having reviewed the parties’ stipulation, and good cause appearing, hereby  
19 approves the revised notice attached hereto as Exhibit A to be sent to potential settlement class  
20 members for whom individual estimates cannot be determined at this point in time. The attached  
21 notice shall be sent to the potential class members at issue as soon as possible, and by no later  
22 than January 21, 2011.

23  
24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: 1/14/11

